arXiv:1408.5672v5 [math.GT] 24 Apr 2016

MARKOV TRACE ON THE ALGEBRA OF BRAIDS AND TIES

FRANCESCA AICARDI AND JESÚS JUYUMAYA

Abstract. We prove that the so–called *algebra of braids and ties* supports a Markov trace. Further, by using this trace in the *Jones' recipe*, we define invariant polynomials for classical knots and singular knots. Our invariants have three parameters. The invariant of classical knots is an extension of the Homflypt polynomial and the invariant of singular knots is an extension of an invariant of singular knots previously defined by S. Lambropoulou and the second author.

1. Introduction

The algebra of braids and ties (defined by generators and relations) firstly appeared in [16], having the purpose of constructing new representations of the braid group. Later, the first author observed that the definition had a redundant relation and provided a graphical interpretation of the generators and relations in terms of braids and ties. In [2] we have investigated this algebra, proving in particular that it is finite–dimensional and discussing the representation theory in low dimension.

Let n be a positive integer. The algebra of braids and ties with parameter u is denoted $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$. Its generators can be regarded as elements of the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}(u)$[17]. In fact, the defining relations of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ come out by imposing the commutation relations of the braid generators of $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}(u)$ with certain idempotents in $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}(u)$ appearing in the square of the braid generators, for details see Subsection 3.2.

The algebra $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ was studied by S. Ryom–Hansen in [24]. He constructed a faithful tensorial representation (Jimbo–type) of this algebra which is used to classify the irreducible representations of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$. Notably, he constructed a basis, showing that the dimension of the algebra is $b_n n!$, where b_n denotes the n–th Bell number. This basis plays a crucial role here to prove that $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ supports a Markov trace. Likewise, the algebra was considered by E. Banjo in her Ph. D. thesis, see [3]. She has related $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ to the ramified partition algebra [22]. More precisely, E. Banjo has shown an explicit isomorphism between the specialized algebra $\mathcal{E}_n(1)$ and a small ramified partition algebra; by using this isomorphism she determined the complex generic representation of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$.

Looking at the graphical interpretation of the generators of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ given in [2], it is natural to try to define an invariant of knots through the same mechanism (Jones' recipe) that defines

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57M25, 20C08, 20F36.

Key words and phrases. Markov trace, knots invariants, algebra of diagrams.

This work was written during a Visiting Fellowship of the second author at the ICTP, Trieste (Italy). The second author has been supported partially by Fondecyt 1141254, DIUV No 1–2011 and by the European Union (European Social Fund ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program 'Education and Lifelong Learning' of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) Research Funding Program: THALES: Reinforcement of the interdisciplinary and/or interinstitutional research and innovation.

the famous Homflypt polynomial [15]. To do that it is essential to have a Markov trace on $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$. Since the algebra $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ was provided with a basis by Ryom–Hansen, a first attempt was to define a trace by the same inductive method used to define the Ocneanu trace on the Hecke algebras, i.e., by constructing an isomorphism between the algebra at level n and a direct sum of algebras at lower levels, for details see the proof [15, Theorem 5.1]. Unfortunately, we could not reproduce this method in our situation because the Ryom–Hansen basis cannot be defined – at least simply – in an inductive manner. We have then adopted successfully the method of *relative traces* [7, 23], using as main reference the work of M. Chlouveraki and L. Poulain d'Andecy [7, Section 5], where it is proved that certain affine and cyclotomic Yokonuma–Hecke algebras support a Markov trace. Other works where the method of relative traces appears are [23, 11, 12, 13], but we don't know whom to credit for this method.

In this paper we prove that $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ supports a Markov trace ρ, that depends on two parameters A and B. Then, by using as ingredient ρ in the Jones' recipe [15] and a representation of the braid group (respectively, of the braid monoid) in $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$, we define an invariant, $\bar{\Delta}(u, \mathsf{A}, \mathsf{B})$, for classical knots (respectively, $\bar{\Gamma}(u, \mathsf{A}, \mathsf{B})$, for singular knots), with parameters u, A and B. Since the definitions of these invariants essentially uses the same formula given by Jones to define the Homflypt polynomial, we can see that the specialization $\bar{\Delta}(u, \mathsf{A}, 1)$ is in fact the Homflypt polynomial. Also, for the same reason it is clear that $\bar{\Delta}(u, \mathsf{A}, 1/m)$ (respectively $\bar{\Gamma}(u, \mathsf{A}, 1/m)$), where m is a positive integer, coincides with the invariant of classical knots (respectively singular knots), defined by S. Lambropoulou and the second author in [19] (respectively [18]). For more information on how strong is the invariant $\bar{\Delta}$, see the Addendum at the end of the paper.

Finally, we note that the invariants defined here can be recovered from an invariant for tied knots, see [1]. The tied knots constitute in fact a new class of knot–like objects in the Euclidean space whose definition is motivated by the graphical interpretation of the defining generators of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ in terms of braid and ties, given in Section 6.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we give the necessary background and the notation used in the paper. In Section 3, we recall the definition and the origin of the algebra of braids and ties (Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 respectively). In Subsections 3.3 and 3.4, we collect some further relations coming from the defining relations of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ and we recall the definition of a basis, found by S. Ryom–Hansen, for this algebra ([24]). In addition, we show some relations among the elements of Ryom–Hansen basis which will be used later. Section 4 contains the main result of this paper, where we prove that $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ supports a Markov trace. This Section is divided in two subsections. The first one is devoted to the construction of a family of relative traces (Theorem 2) which are used in the second Subsection for the definition of the Markov trace on $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$, see Theorem 3. In Section 5, we construct an invariant of classical links (Theorem 4) and an invariant of singular knots (Theorem 5). These invariants can be interpreted, respectively, as a generalization of the Homflypt polynomial and as a generalization of the invariant defined by S. Lambropoulou and the second author; in Subsection 5.3, we explain how these invariants are related. In Section 6, we recall the diagrammatic interpretation of the defining generators of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$ given in [2] according to which one part of the generators is represented as usual braid and the other part as ties. Moreover, we generalize the diagrammatic interpretation of the ties generators, so that the elements of the basis by Ryom–Hansen result in a quite simple form and some defining relations of the algebra become then evident. The paper ends with Section 7, dealing with an interesting question posed by the referee. Also, in this section we introduce the

idea of 'deframization' of a framized algebra, and we propose a natural deframization of certain framized algebras defined by M. Chlouveraki and L. Poulain d'Andecy in [7].

Acknowledgements. The authors are deeply grateful to an anonymous referee, who pointed out different gaps and inaccuracies in the original manuscript, making useful remarks and posing interesting questions. A particular thank also to Marcelo Flores, for having noticed the redundancy of a lemma in a previous version.

2. Notations and background

2.1. Let u be an indeterminate. We denote by K the field of the rational functions $\mathbb{C}(u)$.

The term algebra here indicates an associative unital (with unity 1) algebra over K. Thus, K can be viewed as a subalgebra of the center of the algebra.

As usual we denote by B_n the braid group on n strands. Thus, B_n has the Artin presentation by generators $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}$ and the *braid relations*: $\sigma_i\sigma_j = \sigma_j\sigma_i$, for $|i-j| > 1$ and $\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$. We assume that the braid generators σ_i have positive crossing, represented by the following diagram:



Figure 1. The braid generator σ_i

Let S_n be the symmetric group on the alphabet $\mathbf{n}= \{1, \dots, n\}$, and s_i the transposition $(i,\, i+1)$. Recall that every element $w \in S_n$ can be written (uniquely) in the following form

$$w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{n-1} \tag{1}$$

where $w_i \in \{1, s_i, s_i s_{i-1}, \dots, s_i s_{i-1} \cdots s_1\}$.

2.2. We denote by $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$ the set formed by the set–partitions of $\mathbf{n}$. The cardinality of $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$ is called the n–th Bell number.

The pair $(\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n}), \preceq)$ is a poset. More precisely, setting $I := (I_1, \dots, I_r)$, $J := (J_1, \dots, J_s) \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$, the partial order $\preceq$ is defined by

$$I \preceq J \quad \text{if and only if each } J_k \text{ is a union of some } I_m\text{'s.}$$

If $I \preceq J$ we shall say that I *refines* J.

The subsets of $\mathbf{n}$ entering a partition are called blocks. For short we shall omit the subsets of cardinality 1 (single blocks) in the partition. For example, the partition $I = (\{1,3\}, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{5\}, \{6\})$ in $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{6})$, will be simply written as $I = (\{1,3\})$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Supp}(I)$ will denote the union of non-single blocks of I.

The symmetric group S_n acts naturally on $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$. More precisely, set $I = (I_1, \dots, I_m) \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$. The action $w(I)$ of $w \in S_n$ on I is given by

$$w(I) := (w(I_1), \dots, w(I_m)) \tag{2}$$

where $w(I_k)$ is the subset of $\mathbf{n}$ obtained by applying w to the set I_k.

If I and J are two set–partitions in $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$, we denote $I*J$ the minimal set–partition refined by I and J. Let L be a subset of $\mathbf{n}$. During the work we will use for short $I*L$ to indicate $I*(L)$. So, $I*\{j,m\}$ coincides with I if j and m already belong to the same block in I, otherwise, $I*\{j,m\}$ coincides with I except for the two blocks containing j and m, that merge in a sole block. For short, we shall denote by $I*j$ the set–partition $I*\{j,j+1\}$. For instance, for the set–partition $I=(\{1,2,4\},\{3,5,6\})$:

$$I*\{1,4\}=I \quad \text{and} \quad I*2=(\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}).$$

Finally, for $I\in\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$, we denote $I\backslash n$ the element in $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n-1})$ that is obtained by removing n from I. For example, for the set–partition I of the example above, $I\backslash 6=(\{1,2,4\},\{3,5\})$.

3. The algebra of braids and ties

3.1. We recall here the definition of the algebra of braids and ties $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$. From now on, for brevity, we call this algebra simply the bt–algebra. Further, we shall omit u in $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$.

Definition 1. We set $\mathcal{E}_1=K$ and for every integer $n>1$ we define $\mathcal{E}_n$ as the algebra generated by $T_1,\dots,T_{n-1},E_1,\dots,E_{n-1}$ satisfying the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_iT_j &= T_jT_i \qquad \text{for all } i,j \text{ such that } |i-j|>1 && (3)\\
T_iT_jT_i &= T_jT_iT_j \qquad \text{for all } i,j \text{ such that } |i-j|=1 && (4)\\
T_i^2 &= 1+(u-1)E_i\,(1+T_i) \qquad \text{for all } i && (5)\\
E_iE_j &= E_jE_i \qquad \text{for all } i,j && (6)\\
E_i^2 &= E_i \qquad \text{for all } i && (7)\\
E_iT_i &= T_iE_i \qquad \text{for all } i && (8)\\
E_iT_j &= T_jE_i \qquad \text{for all } i,j \text{ such that } |i-j|>1 && (9)\\
E_iE_jT_i &= T_iE_iE_j = E_jT_iE_j \qquad \text{for all } i,j \text{ such that } |i-j|=1 && (10)\\
E_iT_jT_i &= T_jT_iE_j \qquad \text{for all } i,j \text{ such that } |i-j|=1. && (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. The above definition coincides with the original definition of $\mathcal{E}_n$ under the substitution of u with $1/u$ and of T_i with $-T_i$, see [16].

3.2. Behind the definition of the algebra of braids and ties $\mathcal{E}_n$ there is the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}=\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}(u)$, where d denotes a positive integer. We refer to [21] for the role of this algebra in knot theory and to [8] for its combinatorial representation theory. The algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ can be regarded as a u–deformation of the wreath product of the symmetric group S_n by the cyclic group C_d of order d, in an analogous way as the Hecke algebra is a deformation of S_n. More precisely, the algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ is the algebra generated by the braid generators $g_1,\dots,g_{n-1}$ together with the framing generators $t_1,\dots,t_n$ which satisfy the following relations: the braids relations (said of type A) among the g_i's, $t_it_j=t_jt_i$, $g_it_j=t_{s_i(j)}g_i$, $t_i^d=1$ and

$$g_i^2=1+(u-1)e_i(1+g_i) \tag{12}$$

where e_i is defined by

$$e_i:=\frac{1}{d}\sum_{s=1}^{d}t_i^st_{i+1}^{-s}. \tag{13}$$

Remark 2. Denote by H_n the Hecke algebra of parameter u, that is, the associative K–algebra defined by generators $h_1, \ldots, h_{n-1}$ subject to the braid relations (of type A) among the h_i's and the Hecke quadratic relations $h_i^2 = u + (u-1)h_i$, for all i. We note that for $d = 1$, the algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ is the Hecke algebra, since the elements t_i are trivial, so $e_i = 1$ for all i, and thus (12) becomes the quadratic Hecke relation. It is now clear that the mappings $g_i \mapsto h_i$ and $t_i \mapsto 1$ define an epimorphism from $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ to H_n. We denote this epimorphism by ϕ_n.

The definition of the bt–algebra is obtained by considering abstractly the K– algebra generated by the g_i's and the e_i's. Then g_i becomes T_i, e_i becomes E_i and the set of the defining relations of the bt–algebra corresponds to the complete set of relations derived from the commuting relation among the g_i's and the e_i's. Thus, in particular, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 1. [18, Lemma 2.1] *There is a natural homomorphism $\psi_n : \mathcal{E}_n \to \mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ defined through the mappings $T_i \mapsto g_i$ and $E_i \mapsto e_i$.*

Remark 3.
(1) Observe that the composition $\varphi_n := \phi_n \circ \psi_n$, sending $T_i \mapsto h_i$ and $E_i \mapsto 1$, is an epimorphism from $\mathcal{E}_n$ to H_n.
(2) Assuming as ground field $\mathbb{C}(q)$, where $q^2 = u$, we can deduce from a theorem of J. Espinoza and S. Ryom–Hansen that ψ_n is injective for $d \geq n$, see [9]. Indeed, first we note that in the presentations for $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ and $\mathcal{E}_n$ used in [9] the respective braid generators satisfy quadratic relations modified with respect to the original in [17] and [2]. More precisely, denoting by $\tilde{g}_i$ (respectively $\tilde{T}_i$) the braid generators of the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra (respectively, of the bt–algebra) used in [9], the quadratic relations are $\tilde{g}_i^2 = 1 + (q - q^{-1})e_i\tilde{g}_i$ (respectively $\tilde{T}_i^2 = 1 + (q - q^{-1})E_i\tilde{T}_i$). Now, Theorem 8 in [9] states that for $d \geq n$ the homomorphism $\psi'_n : \mathcal{E}_n \to \mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$, mapping $\tilde{T}_i \mapsto \tilde{g}_i$ and $E_i \mapsto e_i$ is injective. Then the injectivity of ψ_n comes from the fact that $\psi_n = I^{-1} \circ \psi'_n \circ J$, where I and J are the automorphisms defined as the identity on the non–braid generators and on the braid generators by:

$$I(g_i) = \tilde{g}_i + (q-1)e_i\tilde{g}_i \quad \text{and} \qquad J(T_i) = \tilde{T}_i + (q-1)E_i\tilde{T}_i$$

Observe that $I^{-1}(\tilde{g}_i) = g_i + (q^{-1} - 1)e_i g_i$.

3.3. In the present subsection we outline some useful relations among the defining generators and some algebraic properties of the bt–algebra that we will use in the sequel.

First of all, we recall that the fact that the T_i's satisfy the same braiding relations as the generators s_i's of S_n implies, in virtue of a well–known result of Matsumoto, that the following elements T_w are well defined

$$T_w := T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_k}$$

where $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k}$ is a reduced expression for $w \in S_n$.

In the following proposition we list some relations arising directly from the defining relations of $\mathcal{E}_n$. We shall use these relations along the paper mentioning only this proposition.

Proposition 2. *For all i, j, we have:*

(i) *The elements T_i's are invertible. Moreover,*

$$T_i^{-1} = T_i + (u^{-1} - 1)E_i + (u^{-1} - 1)E_iT_i \tag{14}$$

(ii) $T_iT_jT_i^{-1} = T_j^{-1}T_iT_j$, *for* $|i - j| = 1$

(iii) $T_i^3 - uT_i^2 - T_i + u = 0$.

Now, we extract some useful results from [24]. For $i < j$, we define $E_{i,j}$ as

$$E_{i,j} = \begin{cases} E_i & \text{for} \quad j = i+1 \\ T_i \cdots T_{j-2} E_{j-1} T_{j-2}^{-1} \cdots T_i^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

For any nonempty subset J of $\mathbf{n}$ we define $E_J = 1$ if $|J| = 1$ and

$$E_J := \prod_{(i,j)\in J\times J, i<j} E_{i,j}.$$

Note that $E_{\{i,j\}} = E_{i,j}$. Also note that in [24, Lemma 4] it is proved that E_J can be computed as

$$E_J = \prod_{j\in J,\, j\neq i_0} E_{i_0,j} \quad \text{where} \quad i_0 = \min(J). \tag{16}$$

In a similar way one proves that E_J can be computed, writing $J = \{j_0, j_1, \ldots, j_m\}$, with $j_i < j_{i+1}$, as

$$E_J = \prod_{i=1}^{m} E_{j_{i-1},j_i}. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, for $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_m) \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$, we define E_I by

$$E_I = \prod_k E_{I_k}. \tag{18}$$

The action of S_n on $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$, transferred to the elements E_I, is given by the following formulae

$$T_w E_I T_w^{-1} = E_{w(I)} \qquad \text{(see [24, Corollary 1])}. \tag{19}$$

Theorem 1. [24, Corollary 3] *The set $\mathcal{B}_n = \{T_w E_I \,;\, w \in S_n,\, I \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})\}$ is a linear basis of $\mathcal{E}_n$. Hence the dimension of $\mathcal{E}_n$ is $b_n n!$.*

The following corollary can be found also in [2, Proposition 1], cf. [1, Section 5].

Corollary 1. *Any word in the defining generators of $\mathcal{E}_n$ can be written as a linear combination of words in the defining generators of $\mathcal{E}_n$, containing at most one element of the set $\{T_{n-1}, E_{n-1}, T_{n-1}E_{n-1}\}$.*

Remark 4. From the natural inclusions $S_n \subset S_{n+1}$ and $\mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n} \cup \{n+1\})$, it follows that $\mathcal{B}_n$ can be identified with a linearly independent subset of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}$, still denoted by $\mathcal{B}_n$, which is contained in $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$. Then, $\mathcal{E}_n$ can be regarded as a subalgebra of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}$. In particular, we derive the following tower of algebras:

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \subset \mathcal{E}_2 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{E}_n \subset \cdots \tag{20}$$

Note that every element of $\mathcal{B}_n\mathcal{B}_n$ is a linear combination of elements of $\mathcal{B}_n$.

3.4. Because of (1), we have that for every $w \in S_n$ the element $T_w \in \mathcal{B}_n$ can be written uniquely as

$$T_w = T_{w_1} T_{w_2} \cdots T_{w_{n-1}}$$

where

$$T_{w_i} \in \{1, T_i, T_i T_{i-1}, \ldots, T_i T_{i-1} \cdots T_1\}.$$

Set $\mathbb{T}_{i,0} = 1$ and for $k \in \{1, \ldots, i\}$, define

$$\mathbb{T}_{i,k} = T_i T_{i-1} \cdots T_k.$$

Thus the elements of the basis $\mathcal{B}_n$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1} \mathbb{T}_{2,k_2} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_I \tag{21}$$

where $k_j \in \{0, \ldots, j\}$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $I \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$.

Notation 1. *It is convenient to denote $\check{\mathbb{T}}_{i,k}$ the element obtained by removing T_i from $\mathbb{T}_{i,k}$, that is, $\check{\mathbb{T}}_{i,k} = T_{i-1} \cdots T_k$. Consequently, $\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{i,k} = T_{i-2} \cdots T_k$.*

Using the defining relations of $\mathcal{E}_n$ we obtain the following useful relations

$$\mathbb{T}_{i,k} T_j = \begin{cases} \mathbb{T}_{i,k+1} + (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{i,k+1} E_k (1 + T_k) & \text{for} \quad j = k \\ \mathbb{T}_{i,j} & \text{for} \quad j = k-1 \\ T_j \mathbb{T}_{i,k} & \text{for} \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, k-2\} \\ T_{j-1} \mathbb{T}_{i,k} & \text{for} \quad j \in \{k+1, \ldots, i\}. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

We will employ also the following relations which are obtained using only the braid relations:

$$T_i \mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,s} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{T}_{i-1,s-1} \mathbb{T}_{i,r} & \text{for} \quad 0 < r < s \\ \mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,r} \mathbb{T}_{r,s} & \text{for} \quad r \geq s. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

Notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,r} \mathbb{T}_{r,s} \quad = \quad & \mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,r+1} \mathbb{T}_{r-1,s} + (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,r+1} E_r \mathbb{T}_{r-1,s} \\ & + (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{i-1,r} \mathbb{T}_{i,r+1} E_r \mathbb{T}_{r,s}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Also, from (19) we get

$$\mathbb{T}_{i,j} E_I = E_{\theta_{i,j}(I)} \mathbb{T}_{i,j} \tag{25}$$

where $\theta_{i,j} := s_i s_{i-1} \cdots s_j$.

For every $I \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{n})$ and $k < n$, we define

$$\tau_{n,k}(I) = (I * \{k, n\}) \backslash n. \tag{26}$$

Examples 1. *Let $I = (\{1,2,4,6\}, \{3,5\}) \in \mathsf{P}(\mathbf{6})$, then*

$$\tau_{6,1}(I) = (\{1,2,4\}, \{3,5\}) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \tau_{6,3}(I) = (\{1,2,3,4,5\}).$$

If $I = (\{3,5,6\})$ then

$$\tau_{6,3}(I) = (\{3,5\}) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \tau_{6,2}(I) = (\{2,3,5\}).$$

4. Markov trace

In this section we prove that the bt–algebra supports a Markov trace. To do this, we use the method of relative traces taking as main reference [7], (see also [11, 12, 13]). Roughly, the method consists in defining certain linear maps ϱ_n, called relative traces, from $\mathcal{E}_n$ in $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}$, associated to the tower of the algebras (20). Then we prove that the composition of these linear maps is indeed the desired Markov trace (see Theorem 3).

4.1. From now on we fix two parameters A and B in K. However, when needed, we consider A and B as variables and work with the algebras $\mathcal{E}_n \otimes_K K(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{B})$ which we denote for simplicity by the same symbols $\mathcal{E}_n$.

Definition 2. *For every integer $n > 1$, let ϱ_n be the linear map from $\mathcal{E}_n$ to $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ defined on the basis $\mathcal{B}_n$ as follows:*

$$\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_I & \text{for} \quad k_{n-1}=0, \quad n\notin \mathrm{Supp(I)} \\ \mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{I\setminus n} & \text{for} \quad k_{n-1}=0, \quad n\in \mathrm{Supp(I)} \\ \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)} & \text{for} \quad k_{n-1}\neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Observe that ϱ_n acts as the identity on $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}$, hence $\varrho_n(1) = 1$, for all n. Note also that, from the definition of the ϱ_n's, it follows that they satisfy the following:

$$\varrho_n(T_{n-1}) = \varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-1}) = \mathsf{A} \tag{27}$$

$$\varrho_n(E_{n-1}) = \mathsf{B}. \tag{28}$$

Remark 5. The reason of the equality (27) follows from the properties of the relative trace together with the defining relation (10) of the bt–algebra. Indeed, assume that $\mathsf{A} := \varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-1})$ and $\mathsf{A}' := \varrho_n(T_{n-1})$; then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{n-2}\varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-1}) &= \varrho_n(E_{n-2}E_{n-1}T_{n-1}) \\ &= \varrho_n(E_{n-1}E_{n-2}T_{n-1}) \\ &= \varrho_n(E_{n-2}T_{n-1}E_{n-2}) \\ &= E_{n-2}\varrho_n(T_{n-1})E_{n-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $E_{n-2}\varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-1}) = E_{n-2}\varrho_n(T_{n-1})$, which implies $\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{A}'$.

We are going to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The family $\{\varrho_n\}_{n>1}$ satisfies, for all $X, Z \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{E}_n$:*

$$\varrho_n(XYZ) = X\varrho_n(Y)Z \tag{29}$$

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}Y)) = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(YT_{n-1})) \tag{30}$$

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}Y)) = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(YE_{n-1})). \tag{31}$$

Proof. The Lemma 1 below implies (29) and we will prove (30) and (31) in Lemma 2. □

Lemma 1. *For all $X, Z \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{E}_n$, we have:*

(i) $\varrho_n(YZ) = \varrho_n(Y)Z$
(ii) $\varrho_n(XY) = X\varrho_n(Y)$.

Proof. From the linearity of ϱ_n, it follows that it is enough to prove the lemma when $Y \in \mathcal{B}_n$ and X, Z are the generators $T_1, \ldots, T_{n-2}$ and $E_1, \ldots, E_{n-2}$. We set along the proof of the lemma:

$$Y = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I.$$

We prove now the claim (i). We start with the case in which Z is one of the generators T_j, with $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$. We have

$$YZ = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_jE_{s_j(I)} \tag{32}$$

We shall distinguish now three cases, labeled below as Cases I, II and III.

Case I: $k_{n-1} = 0$.

In the case $n \notin$ Supp(I), the claim follows since ϱ_n acts as the identity. For the case $n \in$ Supp(I), we have:

$$\varrho_n(Y)Z = \mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{I\backslash n}T_j = \mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_jE_{s_j(I\backslash n)}.$$

On the other hand, the expression (32) of YZ can be written as a linear combination of elements of the form $WE_{s_j(I)}$ with $W \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. Then, $\varrho_n(YZ) = \mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_jE_{s_j(I)\backslash n}$. Since s_j does not touch n, it follows that $s_j(I\backslash n) = s_j(I)\backslash n$, hence $\varrho_n(Y)Z = \varrho_n(YZ)$.

Case II: $k_{n-1} \neq 0$ and $n \notin$ Supp(I).

Now, according to the commutation rules given in (22), we shall distinguish four subcases.

$*$ Subcase $j = k_{n-1} - 1$. We have

$$YZ = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j}E_{s_j(I)}. \tag{33}$$

Since $n \notin$ Supp($\mathrm{s_j}$(I)), according to Definition 2

$$\varrho_n(YZ) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j}E_{s_j(I)},$$

which is equal to $\varrho_n(Y)Z$. Indeed,

$$\varrho_n(Y)Z = (\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I)T_j = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j}E_{s_j(I)}.$$

$*$ Subcases $j < k_{n-1} - 1$ and $k_{n-1} + 1 \leq j \leq n-1$ are totally analogous to the subcase above.

$*$ Subcase $j = k_{n-1}$. We have $\varrho_n(Y)Z = \varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I)T_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_n(Y)Z &= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_jE_{s_j(I)}\\ &= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_j^2E_{s_j(I)}\end{aligned}$$

By splitting T_j^2, we obtain $\varrho_n(Y)Z = W_1 + W_2 + W_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned}W_1 &:= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{s_j(I)}\\ W_2 &:= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_jE_{s_j(I)}\\ W_3 &:= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_jE_jE_{s_j(I)}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned}YZ &= \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1} + (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1}E_j(1+T_j))E_{s_j(I)}\\ &= W_1' + W_2' + W_3'\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_1' &:= \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1}E_{s_j(I)} \\ W_2' &:= (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1}E_jE_{s_j(I)} \\ W_3' &:= (u-1)\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1}T_jE_jE_{s_j(I)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we observe that $W_i = \varrho_n(W_i')$. Therefore $\varrho_n(Y)Z = \varrho_n(YZ)$.

Case III: $k_{n-1} \neq 0$ and $n \in \mathrm{Supp(I)}$.

Again, we will prove the claim using formulae (22). Suppose $j = k_{n-1} - 1$. Using Definition 2, we get

$$\varrho_n(YZ) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j}E_{\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I))}$$

where $\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I)) = (s_j(I) * \{j,n\})\backslash n$, and

$$\varrho_n(Y) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{\tau_{n,j+1}(I)}$$

where

$$\tau_{n,j+1}(I) = (I * \{j+1,n\})\backslash n. \tag{34}$$

Observe that, since $j < n-1$, $\tau_{n,j+1}(I) = s_{n-1}(\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I)))$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_n(YZ) &= \mathsf{A}(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j}E_{\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I))}) \\ &= \mathsf{A}(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_jE_{\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I))}) \\ &= \mathsf{A}(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{\tau_{n,j+1}(I)})T_j \\ &= \varrho_n(Y)Z. \end{aligned}$$

The cases $j < k_{n-1} - 1$ and $k_{n-1} + 1 \leq j \leq n-1$ are verified in analogous way.

Suppose now $j = k_{n-1}$. We have

$$YZ = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j}T_jE_{s_j(I)}$$

and

$$\varrho_n(YZ) = \varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,j+1}T_j^2E_{s_j(I)}) = V_1 + V_2 + V_3$$

being

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &:= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{\tau_{n,j+1}(s_j(I))} \\ V_2 &:= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{\tau_{n,j+1}(s_j(I))}E_j \\ V_3 &:= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_jE_{\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I))}E_j. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_n(Y)Z &= \mathsf{A}(\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j}E_{\tau_{n,j}(I)})T_j \\ &= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_j^2E_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))}. \end{aligned}$$

Splitting T_j^2, we obtain $\varrho_n(Y)Z = V_1' + V_2' + V_3'$, where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1' &= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))} \\ V_2' &= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}E_jE_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))} \\ V_3' &= (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,j+1}T_jE_jE_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))}. \end{aligned}$$

We have therefore to verify that $V_i = V_i'$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. $V_1' = V_1$ and $V_2' = V_2$ since

$$s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I)) = \tau_{n,j+1}(s_j(I)).$$

As for V_3', we have

$$E_j E_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))} = E_{s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I))*\{j,j+1\}},$$

and

$$s_j(\tau_{n,j}(I)) * \{j, j+1\} = s_j((I * \{j, n\})\backslash n) * \{j, j+1\}.$$

This partition is the same as that in the expression of V_3, namely

$$\tau_{n,j}(s_j(I)) * \{j, j+1\} = ((s_j(I) * \{j, n\})\backslash n) * \{j, j+1\},$$

since $j < n-1$. Thus we have also $V_3 = V_3'$.

To finish the proof of (i) it is left only to consider the case when $Z = E_j$. We have

$$Y E_j = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{I*j}. \tag{35}$$

Observe that $(I\backslash n) * j = (I * j)\backslash n$, because $j < n-1$. Applying Definition 2, we get in all cases $\varrho_n(Y)Z = \varrho_n(YZ)$ since at the end of the left and right sides we have respectively $E_{(I*j)\backslash n}$ and $E_{(I\backslash n)*j}$.

Now we prove the claim (ii) of the lemma. In the case $k_{n-1} = 0$ and $n \notin \mathrm{Supp(I)}$ the claim is evident, since $Y \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ and ϱ_n acts as the identity on $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}$.

In the case $k_{n-1} = 0$ and $n \in \mathrm{Supp(I)}$, we have $Y = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_I$. Then

$$X\varrho_n(Y) = X\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{I\backslash n}.$$

Now, to compute $\varrho_n(XY)$, we need to express XY as linear combination of elements of the basis $\mathcal{B}_n$, but in the case we are considering it is enough to express $X' := X\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}$ as linear combination of elements of $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}$, and then to put the element E_I on the right of each term of this linear combination. Thus, $\varrho_n(XY)$ is the linear combination obtained from the linear combination expressing X', by putting on the right of each term the factor $E_{I\backslash n}$. Hence, we deduce that $X\varrho_n(Y) = \varrho_n(XY)$.

Suppose now that $k_{n-1} \neq 0$. Firstly, we check the claim for $X = T_m$, where $m \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$.

We have $X\varrho_n(Y) = \mathsf{A}T_m\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)}$. We rewrite it as

$$X\varrho_n(Y) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}(T_m\mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,s})\mathbb{B} \tag{36}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{A} &:= \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{m-2,k_{m-2}}\\ \mathbb{B} &:= \mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)}\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$XY = \mathbb{A}(T_m\mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,s})\mathbb{B}' \tag{37}$$

where $0 \leq r \leq m-1$, $0 < s \leq m$ and

$$\mathbb{B}' := \mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I.$$

We will compare now $\varrho_n(XY)$ with $X\varrho_n(Y)$, distinguishing the cases $r = 0$ and $r \neq 0$.

Case $r \neq 0$. By using (23) and later (24) we deduce:

$$X\varrho_n(Y) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}R\mathbb{B} & \text{for} \quad 0 < r \leq s \\ \mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_1\mathbb{B} + (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B} + (u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_3\mathbb{B} & \text{for} \quad s < r \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R &:= \mathbb{T}_{m-1,s-1}\mathbb{T}_{m,r} \\ S_1 &:= \mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1}\mathbb{T}_{r-1,s} = \mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1} \\ S_2 &:= \mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1}E_r\mathbb{T}_{r-1,s} = \mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1}E_{\{a,b\}} \\ S_3 &:= \mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1}T_rE_r\mathbb{T}_{r-1,s} = \mathbb{T}_{m-1,r}\mathbb{T}_{m,s}E_{\{a,b\}} \end{aligned}$$

being $\{a,b\} = \theta^{-1}_{r-1,s}(\{r,r+1\}) = \{s,r+1\}$. Now, by using again (23) and later (24), we get:

$$XY = \begin{cases} \mathbb{A}R\mathbb{B}' & \text{for} \quad 0 < r \leq s \\ \mathbb{A}S_1\mathbb{B}' + (u-1)\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B}' + (u-1)\mathbb{A}S_3\mathbb{B}' & \text{for} \quad s < r \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\varrho_n(XY) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}R\mathbb{B} & \text{for} \quad 0 < r \leq s \\ \varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_1\mathbb{B}') + (u-1)\varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B}') + (u-1)\varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_3\mathbb{B}') & \text{for} \quad s < r \end{cases}$$

Clearly $\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_1\mathbb{B} = \varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_1\mathbb{B}')$. Now, using (25), we obtain

$$\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B}' = \mathbb{A}(\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1})\mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\{a',b'\}}E_I$$

where $\{a',b'\} := \theta^{-1}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}\cdots\theta^{-1}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}(\{a,b\})$.

Now, we have,

$$\varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B}') = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{T}_{m,r+1})\mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I*\{a'b'\})},$$

that is equal to $\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_2\mathbb{B}$ if

$$E_{\{a,b\}}\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I*\{a'b'\})}.$$

But

$$E_{\{a,b\}}\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}E_{\{a'',b''\}} = \mathbb{T}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{(\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I))*\{a'',b''\}}$$

where $\{a'',b''\} = \theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}\cdots\theta^{-1}_{m+1,k_{m+1}}(\{a,b\})$.

Therefore, we have to check that

$$(\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)) * \{a'',b''\} = \tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I * \{a',b'\}). \tag{38}$$

Remember that $r < n-2$ and $s < r$, so $b < (n-1)$. Thus, the pair $\{a',b'\}$ may contain n, while the pair $\{a'',b''\}$ cannot.

Observe also that

$$\{a'',b''\} = \theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}\theta_{n-1,k_{n-1}}\{a',b'\}$$

and $\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}\theta_{n-1,k_{n-1}}$ is the transposition (n,k_{n-1}).

Thus we have to check (38) in two cases:

a) if $\{a',b'\}$ does not contain neither k_{n-1} nor n, then $\{a'',b''\} = \{a',b'\}$ and (38) reads

$$((I * \{n,k_{n-1}\})\backslash n) * \{a',b'\} = ((I * \{a',b'\}) * \{n,k_{n-1}\})\backslash n$$

which is evidently satisfied.

b) If $\{a',b'\}=\{a',n\}$, then $\{a'',b''\}=\{a',k_{n-1}\}$ and (38) reads

$$((I*\{n,k_{n-1}\})\backslash n)*\{a',k_{n-1}\}=((I*\{a',n\})*\{n,k_{n-1}\})\backslash n.$$

Since $a'<n$, both terms are equal to $(I*\{a',n,k_{n-1}\})\backslash n$ and (38) is satisfied.

In a similar way we check that $\varrho_n(\mathbb{A}S_3\mathbb{B}')=\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}S_3\mathbb{B}$. Therefore, $X\varrho_n(Y)=\varrho_n(XY)$ whenever $r\neq 0$.

Case $r=0$. We have that (36) becomes $\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}T_m\mathbb{T}_{m,s}\mathbb{B}=\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}T_m^2\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{B}$. So,

$$T_m\varrho_n(Y)=\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{B}+(u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}E_m\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{B}+(u-1)\mathsf{A}\mathbb{A}E_m\mathbb{T}_{m,s}\mathbb{B}.$$

Now, (37) becomes $\mathbb{A}(T_m\mathbb{T}_{m,s})\mathbb{B}'=\mathbb{A}(T_m^2\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s})\mathbb{B}'$. Then

$$T_mY=\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s}\mathbb{B}'+(u-1)\mathbb{A}(E_m\mathbb{T}_{m-1,s})\mathbb{B}'+(u-1)\mathbb{A}(E_m\mathbb{T}_{m,s})\mathbb{B}'.$$

The equality $\varrho_n(T_mY)=T_m\varrho_n(Y)$ is thus obtained as in the previous case comparing the three terms in both members of the equality.

Finally we check the case (ii) when $X=E_m$, with $1\leq m\leq n-2$. Let

$$Y=\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_I.$$

First case: $k_{n-1}=0$. Since $Y\in\mathcal{E}_n$, $I\backslash n\neq I$. We have

$$XY=\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_IE_{\{a,b\}}$$

where $\{a,b\}=\theta_{n-2,k_{n-2}}^{-1}\cdots\theta_{2,k_2}^{-1}\theta_{1,k_1}^{-1}(\{m,m+1\})$. Moreover $E_IE_{\{a,b\}}=E_{I*\{a,b\}}$.

Therefore,

$$\varrho_n(XY)=\mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{(I*\{a,b\})\backslash n}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}X\varrho_n(Y) &= E_m\mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{I\backslash n}\\ &= \mathsf{B}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}E_{(I\backslash n)*\{a,b\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $m\leq n-2$, a and b cannot be higher than $n-1$, therefore $(I*\{a,b\})\backslash n=(I\backslash n)*\{a,b\}$, so that we get $\varrho_n(XY)=X\varrho_n(Y)$.

Second case: $k_{n-1}\neq 0$. We have

$$XY=\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{I*\{a,b\}}$$

where $\{a,b\}=\theta_{n-1,k_{n-1}}^{-1}\cdots\theta_{2,k_2}^{-1}\theta_{1,k_1}^{-1}(\{m,m+1\})$ and $E_{I*\{a,b\}}=E_IE_{\{a,b\}}$.

Therefore,

$$\varrho_n(XY)=\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I*\{a,b\})}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}X\varrho_n(Y) &= E_m\mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)}\\ &= \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)*\{c,d\}}\end{aligned}$$

where $\{c,d\}=\theta_{n-2,k_{n-1}}^{-1}\cdots\theta_{2,k_2}\theta_{1,k_1}(\{m,m+1\})$. Now, $\varrho_n(XY)=X\varrho_n(Y)$ if the two partitions $\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I*\{a,b\})$ and $\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(I)*\{c,d\}$ are equal, i.e., if

$$((I*\{a,b\})*\{k_{n-1},n\})\backslash n=((I*\{k_{n-1},n\})\backslash n)*\{c,d\}. \tag{39}$$

Observe that

$$\{c,d\} = \theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}(\theta_{n-1,k_{n-1}}\{a,b\}),$$

i.e., $\{c,d\}$ is obtained applying to $\{a,b\}$ the transposition (k_{n-1},n). Observe that, since $m \leq n-2$, $\{a,b\}$ may contain n, while $\{c,d\}$ cannot. Therefore equation (39) is proved exactly as equation (38). Thus, the proof of (ii) is finished.

□

Lemma 2. *For all $X \in \mathcal{E}_n$, we have:*

(i) $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}X)) = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XE_{n-1}))$
(ii) $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X)) = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1}))$
(iii) $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}E_{n-1}X)) = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1}E_{n-1}))$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can suppose $X \in \mathcal{B}_n$. Set

$$X = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J.$$

We prove first the claim (i). Invoking Lemma 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}X)) &= \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J))\\ \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XE_{n-1})) &= \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{n-1}E_J))\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is enough to prove that $E = F$, where

$$\begin{aligned}E &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J))\\ F &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{n-1}E_J)).\end{aligned}$$

To do that, we consider four cases, distinguishing if k_{n-1} and k_{n-2} vanish or not. In the case $k_{n-1} = k_{n-2} = 0$ it is evident that $E = F$.

Case $k_{n-1} = 0$ and $k_{n-2} \neq 0$. We have

$$F = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{n-1}E_J)) = \mathsf{B}\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{(J*(n-1))\setminus n}).$$

On the other part

$$\begin{aligned}E = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_J)) &= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(\{n-1,n\})}E_J))\\ &= \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\varrho_n(E_{\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(\{n-1,n\})}E_J)).\end{aligned}$$

Now, we have $\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(\{n-1,n\}) = \{k_{n-2},n\}$. So, we get

$$\varrho_n(E_{\{k_{n-2},n\}}E_J) = \mathsf{B}E_{(J*\{k_{n-2},n\})\setminus n}.$$

In the case in which $n \notin \mathrm{Supp(J)}$, evidently:

$$(J*\{n-1,n\})\setminus n = (J*\{k_{n-2},n\})\setminus n = J$$

so that $E = F$. In the case in which J contains a set $\{a,\ldots,n\}$, i.e. $J = (\check{J},\{a,\ldots,n\})$,

$$\begin{aligned}(J*\{n-1,n\})\setminus n &= \{\check{J}*\{a,\ldots,n-1\}\} =: J_1\\ (J*\{k_{n-2},n\})\setminus n &= \{\check{J}*\{a,\ldots,k_{n-2}\}\} =: J_2.\end{aligned}$$

Now:

$$F = B(\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{J_1})$$

and

$$E = B(\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}} E_{J_2}).$$

We have, for $i = 1, 2$.

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}} E_{J_i}) = A\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}} E_{J_i'}$$

where $J_i' = \tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(J_i) = (J_i * \{n-1, k_{n-2}\})\backslash(n-1)$. Evidently $J_1' = J_2'$, since J_1 and J_2 are identical up to the transposition of $(n-1)$ with k_{n-1}. Therefore $F = E$.

Case $k_{n-1} \neq 0$ **and** $k_{n-2} = 0$**.** We have

$$F = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{n-1} E_J)) \quad \text{and} \quad E = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_J)).$$

But, $E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_J = \mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{\{k_{n-1},n\}} E_J$, since $\theta^{-1}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}(\{n-1, n\}) = \{k_{n-1}, n\}$. Then

$$E = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J*\{k_{n-1},n\}})) = \varrho_{n-1}(\mathsf{A}\,\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_1})$$

and

$$F = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J*\{(n-1),n\}})) = \varrho_{n-1}(\mathsf{A}\,\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_2})$$

where $J_1 = (J * \{k_{n-1}, n\})\backslash n$ and $J_2 = ((J * \{(n-1), n\}) * \{k_{n-1}, n\})\backslash n$.

Thus E and F can be written as follows (for $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ respectively)

$$\mathsf{A}\,\varrho_{n-1}(\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_i}) = \mathsf{A}^2\,\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_i'}$$

where $J_i' = (J_i * \{k_{n-1}, (n-1)\})\backslash(n-1)$.

Hence the equality $E = F$ follows, as in the preceding case, from the fact that $J_1' = J_2'$.

Case $k_{n-1} \neq 0$ **and** $k_{n-2} \neq 0$**.** From Lemma 1, we get $F = \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{n-1} E_J))$. Then

$$F = \mathsf{A}\,\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_1})$$

where $J_1 = \tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(J * (n-1)) = (J * \{k_{n-1}, (n-1), n\}))\backslash n$.

On the other side, $E_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_J = \mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}} E_{\{k_{n-2},n\}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_J$.

Call $\{a, b\} = \theta^{-1}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}(\{k_{n-2}, n\})$. Observe that $\{a, b\} = \{k_{n-2}, k_{n-1}\}$ if $k_{n-2} < k_{n-1}$, whereas $\{a, b\} = \{k_{n-1}, k_{n-2} + 1\}$ if $k_{n-2} \geq k_{n-1}$.

Using Lemma 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\varrho_n(E_{\{k_{n-2},n\}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_J)) \\ &= \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{\{a,b\}} E_J)) \\ &= \mathsf{A}\,\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} E_{J_2}) \end{aligned}$$

being $J_2 = \tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(J * \{a, b\}) = (J * \{a, k_{n-1}, n\})\backslash n$, where $a = k_{n-2}$ if $k_{n-2} < k_{n-1}$ and $a = k_{n-2} + 1$ otherwise.

Now, $J_1 \neq J_2$, so we have to compare $\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-1}} E_{J_i})$, for $i = 1, 2$. To calculate ϱ_{n-1}, it is convenient to write $\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}$ as

$$\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-1}} = T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}.$$

Then, using the relation $T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-2} = T_{n-3}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}$, and Lemma 1, we get

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-1}} E_{J_i}) = T_{n-3}\ \varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2} E_{J_i'})\ T_{n-3}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}$$

where $J_i' = \Theta(J_i')$, being $\Theta = \theta_{n-3,k_{n-2}}\theta_{n-3,k_{n-1}}$. Let $\{m,\dots,n\}$ be the set of the partition J containing n, and denote $\check{J}$ the set–partition obtained from J by removing the set $\{m,\dots,n\}$. Then,

$$J_1 = (J * \{k_{n-1}, n-1, n\})\backslash n = \check{J} * \{m,\dots,k_{n-1}, n-1\}$$
$$J_2 = (J * \{a, k_{n-1}, n\})\backslash n = \check{J} * \{m,\dots,a, k_{n-1}\}.$$

We can write therefore

$$\Theta(J_1) = \Theta(\check{J}) * \Theta(\{m,\dots,k_{n-1}, n-1\})$$
$$\Theta(J_2) = \Theta(\check{J}) * \Theta(\{m,\dots,a, k_{n-1}\}).$$

Now, we obtain $\Theta(k_{n-1}) = n-3$, and $\Theta(a) = n-2$ in both cases. Therefore, since Θ does not touch $n-1$,

$$\Theta(J_1) = \Theta(\check{J}) * \{\Theta(m),\dots,n-3, n-1\}$$
$$\Theta(J_2) = \Theta(\check{J}) * \{\Theta(m),\dots,n-3, n-2.\}.$$

Now, we have

$$\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{J_i'}) = \mathsf{A}\, E_{\tau_{n-1,n-2}(J_i')}$$

where, for both $i=1$ and $i=2$, we have

$$\tau_{n-1,n-2}(J_i') = (\Theta(J_i)*\{(n-1),(n-2)\})\backslash(n-1) = (\Theta(\check{J})*\{\Theta(m),\dots,n-3,n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1).$$

Therefore, $\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{J_1'}) = \varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{J_2'})$.

We will prove now (ii). Firstly, we study the cases when $k_{n-1}=0$ or $k_{n-2}=0$. In the case $k_{n-1}=0$, we have:

$$T_{n-1}X = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-2}}E_J \quad \text{and} \quad XT_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)}.$$

Then,

$$\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-2}}E_{\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(J)}$$

and

$$\varrho_n(XT_{n-1}) = \mathsf{A}\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{\tau_{n,n-1}(J)}.$$

Now

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X)) = \mathsf{A}^2\,\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(\tau_{n,k_{n-2}}(J))}$$

and

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1})) = \mathsf{A}^2\,\mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}E_{\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(J))}.$$

But

$$\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(\tau_{n,k_{n-2}}(J)) = ((J * \{k_{n-2}, n\})\backslash n) * \{k_{n-2}, n-1\})\backslash(n-1)$$

and

$$\tau_{n-1,k_{n-2}}(\tau_{n,n-1}(J)) = ((J * \{n-1, n\})\backslash n) * \{k_{n-2}, n-1\})\backslash(n-1).$$

The right members of the preceding two equalities are both equal to

$$((J * \{k_{n-2}, n-1, n\})\backslash n)\backslash(n-1)$$

so that the proof is completed.

For the case $k_{n-2}=0$, we have:

$$T_{n-1}X = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J$$

and

$$XT_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1}\mathbb{T}_{2,k_2}\cdots\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)}.$$

By using Lemma 1 we get that $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X))$ and $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1}))$ are different, respectively, in

$$R := \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J)) \text{ and } S := \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)}).$$

It is a routine to check that these two last expression are equal for $k_{n-1} = 0, n-1$. Thus, we need to check only that $R = S$ for $0 < k_{n-1} < n-1$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_J &= T_{n-1}^2T_{n-2}\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}}E_J \\ &= (T_{n-2} + (u-1)E_{n-1}T_{n-2} + (u-1)E_{n-1}T_{n-1}T_{n-2})\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}}E_J \\ &= (T_{n-2} + (u-1)E_{n-1}T_{n-2} + (u-1)E_{n-1}T_{n-1}T_{n-2})E_{\theta_{n-3,k_{n-1}}(J)}\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Let's us call $\Theta := \theta_{n-3,k_{n-1}}$ Then, by using again Lemma 1, we obtain

$$R = (R_1 + (u-1)R_2 + (u-1)R_3)\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(J)})) \\ R_2 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(J)})) \\ R_3 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(E_{n-1}T_{n-1}T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(J)})). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \mathsf{B}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(J)\backslash n}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J_1^R} \\ R_2 &= \mathsf{B}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{(\{n-2,n\}*\Theta(J))\backslash n}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J_2^R} \\ R_3 &= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{\tau_{n,n-2}(\{n-2,n\}*\Theta(J))}) = \mathsf{A}^2E_{J_3^R} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1^R &= ((\Theta(J)\backslash n) * \{n-2, n-1\})\backslash(n-1) \\ J_2^R &= (((\{n-2,n\} * \Theta(J))\backslash n) * \{n-2, n-1\})\backslash(n-1) \\ J_3^R &= \tau_{n-1,n-2}(\tau_{n,n-2}(\{n-2,n\} * \Theta(J)) = J_2^R. \end{aligned}$$

On the other part,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)} &= T_{n-1}T_{n-2}T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}}E_{s_{n-1}(J)} \\ &= T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(s_{n-1}J)}\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, again from Lemma 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-2}E_{\Theta(s_{n-1}J)}))\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}} \\ &= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}^2E_{\tau_{n,n-2}(\Theta(s_{n-1}J)))})\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}} \\ &= (S_1 + (u-1)S_2 + (u-1)S_3)\mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(E_{J^S}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J_1^S} \\ S_2 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(E_{n-2}E_{J^S}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J_2^S} \\ S_3 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{n-2}E_{J^S}) = \mathsf{A}^2E_{J_3^S} \end{aligned}$$

being

$$\begin{aligned} J^S &= \tau_{n,n-2}(\Theta(s_{n-1}J)) = (\Theta(s_{n-1}J) * \{n-2,n\})\backslash n, \\ J_1^S &= J^S\backslash(n-1) = ((\Theta(s_{n-1}J) * \{n-2,n\})\backslash n)\backslash(n-1), \\ J_2^S &= (J^S * \{n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1) = (((\Theta(s_{n-1}J) * \{n-2,n\})\backslash n) * \{n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1), \\ J_3^S &= \tau_{n-1,n-2}(J^S * \{n-2,n-1\}) = (((\Theta(s_{n-1}J) * \{n-2,n\})\backslash n) * \{n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1) = J_2^S. \end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that

$$(\Theta(s_{n-1}J) * \{n-2,n\})\backslash n = ((\Theta(J)\backslash n) * \{n-2,n-1\})$$

since Θ does not touch $n-1, n$. Thus, we have that for $i = 1,2,3$, $J_i^R = J_i^S$, and therefore also $R_i = S_i$. The proof is concluded.

In order to finish the proof of (ii), we have to check the claim in the cases k_{n-1} and k_{n-2} both different from 0. We will compute first $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X))$:

$$T_{n-1}X = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}(T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-3}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-3}}E_J).$$

Then, from Lemma 1:

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}X)) = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}G$$

where $G := \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-2}}E_J))$.

We compute now $\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1}))$. From (25) we have

$$XT_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)}.$$

Lemma 1 implies that

$$\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XT_{n-1})) = \mathbb{T}_{1,k_1} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{n-3,k_{n-3}}H$$

where $H := \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)}))$. Thus, it is enough to prove that $G = H$. We will do this by distinguishing four cases, according to the values of k_{n-1} and k_{n-2}.

Case $k_{n-1} = n-1$ and $k_{n-2} = n-2$. In this case we have: $\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}} = T_{n-2}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} = T_{n-1}$. We have then

$$G = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-1}T_{n-2}T_{n-1}E_J)) \quad \text{and} \quad H = \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})).$$

G can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-2}E_J)) \\ &= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}^2E_{J'}) \\ &= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}((1 + (u-1)E_{n-2} + (u-1)E_{n-2}T_{n-2})E_{J'}) \\ &= G_1 + (u-1)G_2 + (u-1)G_3 \end{aligned}$$

where $J' = (J * \{n, n-2\})\backslash n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(E_{J'}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J'\backslash(n-1)} \\ G_2 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(E_{n-2}E_J) = \mathsf{AB}E_{J'*\{n-2,n-1\}\backslash(n-1)} \\ G_3 &:= \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{n-2}E_J) = \mathsf{A}^2E_{J'*\{n-2,n-1\}\backslash(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to compute H, we firstly note that

$$T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)} = T_{n-2}(1 + (u-1)E_{n-1} + (u-1)T_{n-1}E_{n-1})E_{s_{n-1}(J)}.$$

Then,

$$H = H_1 + (u-1)H_2 + (u-1)H_3$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})) = \mathsf{B}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{s_{n-1}(J)\backslash n}) = \mathsf{AB}E_{s_{n-1}(J)\backslash n}, \\ H_2 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}E_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})) = \mathsf{B}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{s_{n-1}(J)*\{n-1,n\}\backslash n}) \\ &= \mathsf{AB}E_{(((J*\{n-1,n\})\backslash n)*\{n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1)}, \\ H_3 &:= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(T_{n-2}T_{n-1}E_{n-1}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})) = \mathsf{A}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{(J*\{n-1,n\})\backslash n}) \\ &= \mathsf{A}^2E_{(((J*\{n-1,n\})\backslash n)*\{n-2,n-1\})\backslash(n-1).} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the equality $G = H$ is a consequence of the equalities $G_i = H_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

We will analyze now the remaining cases $0 < k_{n-1} < n-1$ and $0 < k_{n-2} < n-2$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} &= T_{n-1}(T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-3}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}})\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= T_{n-2}T_{n-1}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$T_{n-1}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-2}}E_J = T_{n-2}T_{n-1}E_{J'}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \tag{40}$$

where $J' := \theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(J)$. Thus, by using Lemma 1, we get

$$G = \varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}\varrho_n(T_{n-1}E_{J'})\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}) = \mathsf{A}G'$$

where $G' := \varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_{\tau_{n,n-1}(J')}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}})$. Now, we have

$$T_{n-2}E_{\tau_{n,n-1}(J')}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} = E_{J''}T_{n-2}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}},$$

where $J'' := s_{n-2}(\tau_{n,n-1}(J'))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{J''}T_{n-2}\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} &= E_{J''}T_{n-2}(T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}})\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= E_{J''}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= E_{J''}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-3}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= T_{n-3}(T_{n-2}E_{J'''})T_{n-3}T_{n-3}\cdots T_{k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

where $J''' := s_{n-2}s_{n-3}J'' = (n-3, n-1)(\tau_{n,n-1}(J'))$. Therefore

$$G' = \mathsf{A}\,T_{n-3}E_{\tau_{n-1,n-2}(J''')}T_{n-3}T_{n-3}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}.$$

In H, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-2}\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})) \quad \text{(from (22))} \\ &= \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-2}\varrho_n(\mathbb{T}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{s_{n-1}(J)})) \quad \text{(from Lemma 1)} \\ &= \mathsf{A}H' \end{aligned}$$

where $H' := \varrho_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-2}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(s_{n-1}J)})$. Observe now that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-2}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} &= T_{n-2}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}T_{n-2}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= T_{n-3}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}T_{n-3}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{T}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}T_{n-2}\check{\mathbb{T}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}E_{\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(s_{n-1}J)} = T_{n-3}T_{n-3}T_{n-2}E_IT_{n-3}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}$$

where $I := \theta_{n-3,k_{n-2}}\theta_{n-3,k_{n-1}}(\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(s_{n-1}J))$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} H' &= T_{n-3}T_{n-3}\varrho_{n-1}(T_{n-2}E_I)T_{n-3}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}} \\ &= \mathsf{A}\,T_{n-3}T_{n-3}E_{\tau_{n-1,n-2}(I)}T_{n-3}\mathbb{T}_{n-4,k_{n-2}}\check{\check{\mathbb{T}}}_{n-1,k_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to have $G' = H'$ and then $G = H$, it is enough to prove that

$$T_{n-3}E_{\tau_{n-1,n-2}(J''')}T_{n-3}T_{n-3} = T_{n-3}T_{n-3}E_{\tau_{n-1,n-2}(I)}T_{n-3}$$

i.e. that

$$\tau_{n-1,n-2}(J''') = s_{n-3}\tau_{n-1,n-2}(I).$$

The left member is equal to

$$\tau_{n-1,n-2}((n-3,n-1)\tau_{n,n-1}(\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-1}}\theta^{-1}_{n-2,k_{n-2}}(J))) \tag{41}$$

while the right member is equal to

$$s_{n-3}\tau_{n-1,n-2}(\theta_{n-3,k_{n-2}}\theta_{n-3,k_{n-1}}(\tau_{n,k_{n-1}}(s_{n-1}J))). \tag{42}$$

Observe that (41)=(42) in the extreme situations when $J = (\ ) = (\{1\},\{2\},\dots,\{n\})$ and $J = (\{1,2,\dots,n\})$. In both these cases (41) and (42) are given by $(J\backslash n)\backslash(n-1)$. Otherwise, we have to distinguish the cases $k_{n-2} < k_{n-1}$ and $k_{n-2} \geq k_{n-1}$, and the proof is done by comparing the set–partitions. We prefer to avoid two further boring pages of calculations, using the same arguments as in the proof of point (i). Let's give a non trivial example. Let $n = 7$, $k_6 = 3$, $k_5 = 1$ and $J = (\{1,2\},\{3\},\{5,7\},\{4,6\})$. We calculate (41):

$$\begin{aligned} J &= (\{1,2\},\{3\},\{5,7\},\{4,6\}) \\ J' = \theta^{-1}_{5,3}\theta^{-1}_{5,1}(J) &= (\{2,4\},\{5\},\{3,7\},\{6,1\}) \\ J'' = \tau_{7,6}(J') &= (\{2,4\},\{5\},\{3,6,1\}) \\ J''' = (4,6)(J'') &= (\{2,6\},\{5\},\{3,4,1\}) \\ \tau_{6,5}(J''') &= (\{2,5\},\{3,4,1\}). \end{aligned}$$

As for (42), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} J &= (\{1,2\},\{3\},\{5,7\},\{4,6\}) \\ J' = s_6(J) &= (\{1,2\},\{3\},\{5,6\},\{4,7\}) \\ J'' = \tau_{7,3}(J') &= (\{1,2\},\{5,6\},\{3,4\}) \\ J''' = \theta_{4,3}^{-1}\theta_{4,1}^{-1}(J'') &= (\{5,1\},\{3,6\},\{2,4\}) \\ \tilde{J} = \tau_{6,5}(J''') &= (\{5,1,3\},\{2,4\}) \\ s_4(\tilde{J}) &= (\{4,1,3\},\{2,5\}). \end{aligned}$$

The claim (iii) follows directly from claims (i) and (ii).

□

4.2. Let us define ϱ_1 as the identity and for every positive integer we define the linear map $\rho_n : \mathcal{E}_n \to \mathcal{E}_1 = K(\mathsf{A},\mathsf{B})$ by

$$\rho_n = \varrho_1 \circ \varrho_2 \circ \cdots \circ \varrho_{n-1} \circ \varrho_n.$$

Observe that

$$\rho_n = \rho_{n-1} \circ \varrho_n,$$

and that, for $k \leq n$ and $X \in \mathcal{E}_k$,

$$\rho_n(X) = \rho_k(X). \tag{43}$$

Also, from the definition of ϱ_n, it follows that $\rho_n(1) = 1$. Moreover, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The family $\rho := \{\rho_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is a Markov trace. That is, for every $n \geq 1$ ρ_n has the following properties:*

(i) $\rho_n(1) = 1$
(ii) $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(YX)$
(iii) $\rho_{n+1}(XT_n) = \rho_{n+1}(XE_nT_n) = \mathsf{A}\rho_n(X)$
(iv) $\rho_{n+1}(XE_n) = \mathsf{B}\rho_n(X)$

where $X, Y \in \mathcal{E}_n$.

Proof. We will prove (ii) by induction on n. For $n = 2$ clearly the claim is true since $\mathcal{E}_2$ is commutative. Suppose now the claim be true for all k less than n.

Firstly, we are going to prove (ii) for $X \in \mathcal{E}_n$ and $Y \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n(XY) &= \rho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XY)) \\ &= \rho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(X)Y) \quad \text{((i) Lemma 1)} \\ &= \rho_{n-1}(Y\varrho_n(X)) \quad \text{(induction hypothesis)} \\ &= \rho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(YX)) \quad \text{((ii) Lemma 1).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(YX) \qquad (X \in \mathcal{E}_n, Y \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}). \tag{44}$$

Secondly, we prove (ii) for $Y \in \{T_{n-1},\, E_{n-1}, T_{n-1}E_{n-1}\}$. We have $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_{n-2}(\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(XY)))$, then from Lemma 2, we deduce $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_{n-2}(\varrho_{n-1}(\varrho_n(YX)))$. Hence

$$\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(YX) \qquad (X \in \mathcal{E}_n, Y \in \{T_{n-1},\, E_{n-1}, T_{n-1}E_{n-1}\}). \tag{45}$$

Now, having in mind Corollary 1 and the linearity of ρ_n, to prove claim (ii) it is enough to consider Y in the form Y_1FY_2, where $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ and $F \in \{T_{n-1}, E_{n-1}, T_{n-1}E_{n-1}\}$. Indeed, if $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(XY_1FY_2)$, then, by using (44), we have $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(Y_2XY_1F)$. By using now (45), we obtain $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(FY_2XY_1)$. Thus, by using again (44), we get $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(Y_1FY_2X)$. Hence, $\rho_n(XY) = \rho_n(YX)$.

The proofs of the statements (iii) and (iv) are analogous. We shall prove only that, if $X \in \mathcal{E}_n$, then $\rho_{n+1}(XT_n) = \mathsf{A}\rho_n(X)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{n+1}(XT_n) &= \rho_n(\varrho_{n+1}(XT_n)) \\ &= \rho_n(X\varrho_{n+1}(T_n)) \quad \text{((ii) Lemma 1)} \\ &= \rho_n(X\mathsf{A}) \\ &= \mathsf{A}\rho_n(X).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6. Observe that rule (iv) in the above theorem is the condition on the Markov trace of the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra requested to have the invariant defined by S. Lambropoulou and the second author, see [20, 18, 19]. More precisely, this property allows to factorize $\rho_n(X)$ in the computation of $\rho_{n+1}(XT_n^{-1})$, where $X \in \mathcal{E}_n$, as we will show in the following section (see formula (50)).

5. Applications to Knot invariants

In this section we will construct an invariant for classical knots and another invariant for singular knots. The constructions follow the Jones' recipe, that is, they are obtained from normalization and rescaling of the composition of a representation of a braid group/singular braid monoid in $\mathcal{E}_n$ with the trace ρ_n.

In both invariants we will use the element of normalization $\mathsf{L} = \mathsf{L}(u, \mathsf{A}, \mathsf{B})$, defined as follows

$$\mathsf{L} = \frac{\mathsf{A} + (1-u)\mathsf{B}}{u\mathsf{A}}, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \mathsf{A} = -\frac{1-u}{1-\mathsf{L}u}\mathsf{B}. \tag{46}$$

5.1. In order to define our invariant for classical knots, we recall some classical facts and standard notation. Firstly, remember that according to the classical theorems of Alexander and Markov, the set of isotopy classes of links in the Euclidean space is in bijection with the set of equivalence classes obtained from the inductive limit of the tower of braid groups $B_1 \subseteq B_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq B_n \subseteq \cdots$, under the *Markov equivalence relation* $\sim$. That is, for all $\alpha, \beta \in B_n$, we have:

(i) $\alpha\beta \sim \beta\alpha$
(ii) $\alpha \sim \alpha\sigma_n$ and $\alpha \sim \alpha\sigma_n^{-1}$.

Secondly, let us denote $\bar{\pi}_{\mathsf{L}}$ the representation of B_n in $\mathcal{E}_n$, namely $\sigma_i \mapsto \sqrt{\mathsf{L}}T_i$. Then, for $\alpha \in B_n$, we define $\bar{\Delta}(\alpha)$

$$\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) := \left(-\frac{1-\mathsf{L}u}{\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}(1-u)\mathsf{B}}\right)^{n-1} (\rho_n \circ \bar{\pi}_{\mathsf{L}})(\alpha) \in K(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}, B). \tag{47}$$

It is useful to have an alternative expression for $\bar{\Delta}(\alpha)$, in terms of the exponent $e(\sigma)$ of α, where $e(\alpha)$ is the algebraic sum of the exponents of the elementary braids σ_i used for writing α. Then, we have:

$$\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) = \left(-\frac{1-\mathsf{L}u}{\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}(1-u)\mathsf{B}}\right)^{n-1} (\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)}(\rho_n \circ \bar{\pi})(\alpha) \tag{48}$$

where $\bar{\pi}$ is defined as the mapping $\sigma_i \mapsto T_i$. Now, we have

$$\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}\,\bar{D}\,\mathsf{A} = 1, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{D} := -\frac{1-\mathsf{L}u}{\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}(1-u)\mathsf{B}}. \tag{49}$$

Then, notice that $\bar{\Delta}(\alpha)$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) = \bar{D}^{n-1}(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)}(\rho_n \circ \bar{\pi})(\alpha).$$

Theorem 4. *Let L be a link obtained by closing the braid $\alpha \in B_n$. Then the map $L \mapsto \bar{\Delta}(\alpha)$ defines an isotopy invariant of links.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that $\bar{\Delta}$ respects the Markov equivalence relations. In virtue of Theorem 3 (ii), it is evident that $\bar{\Delta}$ respects the first Markov equivalence. We have to prove the second Markov equivalence. Again, it is easy to check that $\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) = \bar{\Delta}(\alpha\sigma_n)$. In fact, up to now we have only used the properties of the trace ρ_n, in which the elements E_i's do not play any role. But now, to prove that $\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) = \bar{\Delta}(\alpha\sigma_n^{-1})$, the defining conditions of ρ_n involving the elements E_i's are crucial (see Remark 6).

For every $\alpha \in B_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}(\alpha\sigma_n^{-1}) &= \bar{D}^n(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha\sigma_n^{-1})}(\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha\sigma_n^{-1})) \\ &= \bar{D}^n(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)-1}(\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)T_n^{-1})). \end{aligned}$$

By using the formulae of T_n^{-1} (see Proposition 2) and the defining rule of ρ_n, we deduce:

$$\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)T_n^{-1}) = \rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha))(\mathsf{A} + (u^{-1}-1)\mathsf{B} + (u^{-1}-1)\mathsf{A}). \tag{50}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}(\alpha\sigma_n^{-1}) &= \bar{D}^n(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)-1}(u^{-1}\mathsf{A} + (u^{-1}-1)\mathsf{B})\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)) \\ &= (\bar{D}/\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})(u^{-1}\mathsf{A} + (u^{-1}-1)\mathsf{B})\bar{D}^{n-1}(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)}\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)) \\ &= (\bar{D}/\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})\mathsf{A}\mathsf{L}\bar{D}^{n-1}(\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{e(\alpha)}\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)) \\ &= \bar{\Delta}(\alpha) \qquad \text{(by (49))}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 1. *Let α be the simplest oriented link, formed by two oriented circles with two positive crossings. We obtain*

$$\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\alpha)) = 1 + (\mathsf{A}+\mathsf{B})(u-1)$$

and

$$\bar{\Delta}(\alpha) = \sqrt{\frac{\mathsf{A}+\mathsf{B}(1-u)}{u\mathsf{A}}}\left(\frac{1+(\mathsf{A}+\mathsf{B})(u-1)}{\mathsf{A}}\right).$$

Example 2. *Let γ be the trefoil knot with positive crossings. We obtain*

$$\rho_n(\bar{\pi}(\gamma)) = \frac{\mathsf{B}(1-u+u^2-u^3)+\mathsf{A}(1-u+u^2)}{u^3}$$

and

$$\bar{\Delta}(\gamma) = \frac{\mathsf{A}(-u^3\mathsf{B} + u^2\mathsf{B} - u\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{B} + u^2\mathsf{A} - u\mathsf{A} + \mathsf{A})}{u(\mathsf{A} + \mathsf{B} - u\mathsf{B})^2}.$$

5.2. For the singular links in the Euclidean space, the singular braid monoid plays an analogous role as that of the braid group for the classical links. The singular braid monoid was introduced independently by three authors: J. Baez, J. Birman and L. Smolin (see [17] and the references therein).

Definition 3. *The singular braid monoid SB_n is defined as the monoid generated by the usual braid generators $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1}$ (invertible) subject to the following relations: the braid relations among the σ_i's together with the following relations:*

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \tau_i\tau_j & = & \tau_j\tau_i & \text{for} \quad |i-j| > 1 \\ \sigma_i\tau_j & = & \tau_j\sigma_i & \text{for} \quad |i-j| > 1 \\ \sigma_i\tau_i & = & \tau_i\sigma_i & \text{for all} \quad i \\ \sigma_i\sigma_j\tau_i & = & \tau_j\sigma_i\sigma_j & \text{for} \quad |i-j| = 1. \end{array}$$

Now, in an analogous way to the classical links, we define the isotopy of the singular links in the Euclidean space in purely algebraic terms. More precisely, for the singular links we have the analogue of the classical Alexander theorem, which is due to J. Birman [4]. We have also the analogue of the classical Markov theorem, which is due to B. Gemein [10]. Thus, the set of the isotopy classes of singular knots is in bijection with the set of equivalence classes defined on the inductive limit associated to the tower of monoids: $SB_1 \subseteq SB_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq SB_n \subseteq \cdots$ with respect to the equivalence relation $\sim_s$:

(i) $\alpha\beta \sim_s \beta\alpha$
(ii) $\alpha \sim_s \alpha\sigma_n$ and $\alpha \sim_s \alpha\sigma_n^{-1}$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in SB_n$.

Now we have to define a representation of SB_n in the algebra $\mathcal{E}_n$. This representation uses the same expression as in [18] for its definition. More precisely, we define the representation $\bar{\delta}$ by mapping:

$$\sigma_i \mapsto T_i \quad \text{and} \qquad \tau_i \mapsto E_i(1 + T_i).$$

Proposition 3. *$\bar{\delta}$ is a representation.*

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that the images of the defining generators of SB_n satisfy the defining relations of SB_n. □

In order to define our invariant for singular knots we need to introduce the exponent for the elements of SB_n. From the definition of SB_n, it follows that every element $\omega \in SB_n$ can be written in the form

$$\omega = \omega_1^{\epsilon_1} \cdots \omega_m^{\epsilon_m}$$

where the ω_i are taken from the defining generators of SB_n and $\epsilon_i = 1$ or -1, and assuming moreover that in the case ω_i is any of the generators τ_i, its exponent ϵ_i is by definition equal to 1. Then we have the following

Definition 4. [18, Definition 2] *The exponent $\epsilon(\omega)$ of ω is defined as the sum $\epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_m$.*

For $\omega \in SB_n$, we define $\bar{\Gamma}$ as follows

$$\bar{\Gamma}(\omega) = \left(-\frac{1-\mathsf{L}u}{\sqrt{\mathsf{L}}(1-u)B}\right)^{n-1} (\sqrt{\mathsf{L}})^{\epsilon(\omega)}(\rho_n \circ \bar{\delta})(\omega).$$

We have then the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *Let L be a singular link obtained by closing $\omega \in SB_n$; then the mapping $L \mapsto \bar{\Gamma}(\omega)$ defines an invariant of singular links.*

Proof. The proof is totally analogous to the proof of [18, Theorem 5]. See also the proof of Theorem 4. □

5.3. **Comparisons.** In this subsection we shall show how to obtain known invariant polynomials for classical knots from the three–variable invariant $\bar{\Delta}$ defined in this paper.

In [15, Section 6] V. Jones constructed a Homflypt polynomial, denoted X, invariant for classical links, through the composition of the Ocneanu trace τ_n, of parameter z, on H_n and the representation $\pi_\lambda : B_n \to \mathrm{H}_n$, $\sigma_i \mapsto \sqrt{\lambda} h_i$, where

$$\lambda = \frac{z + (1-u)}{uz}.$$

More precisely, for $\alpha \in B_n$, such Homflypt polynomial is defined by

$$\mathrm{X}(\alpha) = \left(-\frac{1-\lambda u}{\sqrt{\lambda}(1-u)}\right)(\tau_n \circ \pi_\lambda)(\alpha).$$

Thus, setting $\mathsf{A} = z$ and $\mathsf{B} = 1$ in (46), we obtain $\mathsf{L} = \lambda$. Then, for φ_n of Remark 3, we have $\varphi_n \circ \pi_{\mathsf{L}} = \pi_\lambda$. Also, for these values of A and B we have $\varphi_n \circ \tau_n = \rho_n$. Then

$$\tau_n \circ \pi_\lambda = \tau_n \circ (\varphi_n \circ \pi_{\mathsf{L}}) = \rho_n \circ \pi_{\mathsf{L}}.$$

Therefore, it follows that the Homflypt polynomial X can be obtained by taking $\mathsf{A} = z$ and specializing $\mathsf{B} = 1$.

Now we show how to obtain from $\bar{\Delta}$ the two–parameters invariants of classical links defined in [19].

The Yokonuma–Hecke algebra $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$ also supports a Markov trace, denoted tr, of parameters z and $x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}$, see [17, Theorem 12]. In [20] it is proved that for certain specific values of the trace parameters x_i's it is possible to construct an invariant of classical links Δ. More precisely, these specific values, which are solutions of the so–called E–system, are parametrized by non–empty subsets of the group of integers modulo d. Now, given such a subset S, we shall denote tr_S the trace tr, whenever the parameters x_k's are taken as the solutions of the E–system, parametrized by S. Now, the mapping $\sigma_i \mapsto \sqrt{\lambda_S} g_i$ defines a representation $\tilde{\pi}_{\lambda_S}$ of B_n in $\mathrm{Y}_{d,n}$, where

$$\lambda_S = \frac{z + (1-u)/|S|}{uz}.$$

The two–variable polynomial invariant of classical knots Δ is defined as follows

$$\Delta(\alpha) = \left(-\frac{1-\lambda_S u}{\sqrt{\lambda_S}(1-u)}\right)(\mathrm{tr}_S \circ \tilde{\pi}_{\lambda_S})(\alpha) \qquad (\alpha \in B_n)$$

for details see [19]. By taking the parameter $z = \mathsf{A}$ and specializing B to $1/|S|$, we get that $\lambda_S = \mathsf{L}$. Then, we have $\psi_n \circ \bar{\pi}_{\mathsf{L}} = \tilde{\pi}_\lambda$ and $\mathrm{tr}_S \circ \psi_n = \rho_n$, where ψ_n is defined in Proposition 1. Thus,

$$\mathrm{tr}_S \circ \tilde{\pi}_{\lambda_S} = \mathrm{tr}_S \circ (\psi_n \circ \bar{\pi}_{\mathsf{L}}) = \rho_n \circ \bar{\pi}_{\mathsf{L}}.$$

Therefore, also the two–variable invariant of classical links Δ can be obtained from the three-variable invariant $\bar{\Delta}$.

6. A diagrammatical interpretation

In this section we recall a diagrammatical interpretation of the defining generators of $\mathcal{E}_n(u)$, given in [2]. Furthermore, derived from this diagrammatical interpretation, we show a diagrammatic interpretation of the basis constructed by S. Ryom–Hansen, in which one part of the elements of this basis looks as *elastic* ties.

Such interpretation provides in fact an epimorphism from the algebra $\mathcal{E}_n$ to an algebra of diagrams, that we call $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$, generated by the braid generators, by elastic ties having some peculiar properties explained below, and satisfying the quadratic relation (5). We do not furnish here a formal proof that $\mathcal{E}_n$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$ are isomorphic. However, in what follows, we will see that this isomorphism is crucial, because the diagram calculus is considerably easier than the algebraic one. Therefore we enunciate the following

Conjecture 1. *The algebras $\mathcal{E}_n$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$ are isomorphic.*

6.1. In [2] we have interpreted the generator T_i as the usual braid generator and the generator E_i as a tie between the consecutive strings i and $i+1$.

FIGURE 2. Generators T_i, left, and E_i, right

The relations (3) and (4) of $\mathcal{E}_n$, involving only the generators T_i's, have thus the usual interpretation in terms of braid diagrams. The diagrammatic interpretation of the other relations, involving also the generators E_i's, are shown in Figures 3 – 5.

Observe that relations (6), (8), (9) and (11), depicted in Figure 3, simply indicate that a tie between two threads can move upwards and downwards along a braid as long as *such threads maintain unit distance* (we can always suppose that at each crossing the threads maintain their distance in the three-dimensional space).

On the other hand, observe that this shifting property of ties does not give reason for relation (10), that is shown in Figure 4. Relation (7) in Figure 4 says that two or more ties between two threads are equivalent to one sole tie.

Finally, as in the Hecke algebra, the 'quadratic relation' (5) takes account of the splitting of the square of the braid generators in terms of the defining generators. This relation is formally shown, in terms of diagrams, in Figure 5.



FIGURE 3. Relations (6), (8), (9) and (11) in diagrams



FIGURE 4. Relations (7) and (10) in diagrams



FIGURE 5. Relation (5) in diagrams

Remark 7. Relations (8)–(11) in $\mathcal{E}_n$ hold also if all generators T_i's are replaced by their inverses. This is verified by using formula (14) for the T_i^{-1}s and relation (7). The diagrams of the new relations for the T_i^{-1}'s are obtained replacing the positive crossing by negative crossings in the corresponding diagrams.

However, substituting only T_i (or only T_j) by its inverse in (11), we obtain for instance the following

$$E_{i+1}T_i^{-1}T_{i+1} = \quad T_i^{-1}T_{i+1}E_i.$$

This relation is depicted in figure 6. We can thus observe, as we have already done in [2], that *a tie is allowed to bypass a thread.*

6.2. **Elastic ties.** Recall that the linear basis constructed by Ryom–Hansen (Theorem 1) for $\mathcal{E}_n$ consists of elements of the form $T_w E_I$, where $w \in S_n$ and $I \in \mathsf{P}_n$. The diagrammatic interpretation for the elements T_w is standard since the elements T_i's are represented by usual braids.



FIGURE 6.

Remember that the elements E_I's are defined by means of the $E_{i,j}$'s, where $i < j$, see (15). We introduce now a simple diagrammatic representation of the element $E_{i,j}$, by means of an *elastic tie* (or *spring*) connecting the threads i and j, see Figure 7. We shall say that the spring representing $E_{i,j}$ has *length* $j - i$, so that the element of unit length $E_{i,i+1}$ coincides with E_i.



FIGURE 7.

Because of the elastic property of the springs, we immediately see the accordance with the original definition of $E_{i,j}$:

$$E_{i,j} = T_i \cdots T_{j-2} E_{j-1} T_{j-2}^{-1} \cdots T_i^{-1}.$$

Moreover, in Figure 8 we show how $E_{i,j}$ (here, $E_{2,7}$) can be written in an equivalent manner by different elements of the algebra. (In fact, any generator T_k at left of E_{j-1} may have positive or negative unit exponent, providing that at right of E_{j-1} the same generator has the opposite exponent).

6.3. **Properties of the elastic ties.** Besides *elasticity*, the springs have some properties that can be deduced by algebraic calculations (see [1] for more details and proofs). Here we show these properties.

6.3.1. *Transparency.* Firstly, the ties are *transparent* for the threads, i.e., they can be drawn no matter if in front or behind the threads. This can be observed in Figure 8.

Observe also that relation (11), as well as Remark 7, have a generalization for springs of any length, as shown in Figure 9 (case of length equal to 2).



FIGURE 8. $E_{2,7} = T_2T_3T_4T_5E_6T_5^{-1}T_4^{-1}T_3^{-1}T_2^{-1} \quad \sim \quad T_6T_5T_4T_3E_2T_3^{-1}T_4^{-1}T_5^{-1}T_6^{-1}$.

FIGURE 9.

6.3.2. *Transitivity.* The product of three springs $E_{i,j}$ $E_{j,k}$ and $E_{i,k}$ connecting the threads i, j, and k, is equivalent to the product of any two of the springs. So, in particular $E_{i,j}E_{i,k}$ is equivalent to the product $E_{i,j}E_{j,k}$. Note that this property implies the equivalence of formulae (16) and (17). We shall show two cases for $n = 7$.

Set

$$I_1 := (\{2,3,5,7\},\{1,4,6\}), \quad I_2 := (\{2,3,5,6,7\},\{1\},\{4\}).$$

Then E_{I_1} and E_{I_2} have the diagrams shown in Figure 10, according to (16).



FIGURE 10. $E_{I_1} = (E_{2,3}E_{2,5}E_{2,7})(E_{1,4}E_{1,6})$ $\qquad$ $E_{I_2} = (E_{2,3}E_{2,5}E_{2,6}E_{2,7})$

These elements can be represented by the diagrams drawn in Figure 11.



FIGURE 11. $E_{I_1} = (E_{2,3}E_{3,5}E_{5,7})(E_{1,4}E_{4,6})$ $\qquad$ $E_{I_2} = (E_{2,3}E_{3,5}E_{5,6}E_{6,7})$

6.3.3. *Mobility.* Let $s = \pm 1$. Observe the identities

$$T_i^s E_{i+1} = T_i^s E_{i+1}(T_i^{-s}T_i^s) = (T_i^s E_{i+1} T_i^{-s})T_i^s = E_{i,i+2}T_i^s, \tag{51}$$

$$E_{i+1}T_i^s = (T_i^s T_i^{-s})E_{i+1}T_i^s = T_i^s(T_i^{-s}E_{i+1}T_i^s) = T_i^s E_{i,i+2}. \tag{52}$$

They can be interpreted as the sliding of the tie up and down along the braid under stretching or contracting. In other words, while the element $T_i^{\pm 1}$ does not commute with E_j when $|j-i| = 1$, equations (51) and (52) provide a sort of commutation rule between $T_i^{\pm 1}$ and the elastic tie. See in Figure 12 the sliding down (by contracting) of the red spring and the sliding down of the green spring (by extending).

Similarly, a spring $E_{i,j}$ of any length bigger than one, 'commutes' (changing its length by ± 1) with T_i and T_{i-1}, as well as with T_{j-1} and T_j, according to the equalities:

$$E_{i,j}T_i = T_i E_{i+1,j}, \quad E_{i,j}T_{i-1} = T_{i-1}E_{i-1,j}, \quad E_{i,j}T_j = T_j E_{i,j+1}, \quad E_{i,j}T_{j-1}T_{j-1} = E_{i,j-1}.$$

The same equalities hold for the inverse of the generators T_i's.

Remark 8. The peculiar relation (10), see Figure 4, plays an essential role, together with relation (7), in the proof of the transitivity property. Using this property and the mobility property, relation (10) in terms of springs becomes clear, as Figure 12 shows.



FIGURE 12. T and M indicate the Transitivity and Mobility properties

7. Side Comments

We conclude with two comments which we think deserve to be examined in depth.

7.1. The referee has suggested the following: it would be interesting to know whether there is an integrable model based on the bt–algebra and built with the use of relative traces. According to the referee report, a good indication of the existence of an integrable model related to the bt–algera is the fact that the relative trace has the following property. For all $X \in \mathcal{E}_{n-1}$, we have:

$$\varrho_n(T_{n-1}^{-1} X T_{n-1}) = \varrho_{n-1}(X), \qquad \varrho_n(T_{n-1} X T_{n-1}^{-1}) = \varrho_{n-1}(X).$$

7.2. In Subsection 3.2 it was noted that the bt–algebra is conceived from the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra. Now, the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra can be regarded as the prototype example of the framization of a knot algebra, see [21] for the concept of framization and knot algebra. In few words, the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra can be considered as the Hecke algebra to which one adds framing generators: the defining generators of the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra consist in fact in a set of braid generators and a set of framing generators.

As we explained is Subsection 3.2, the construction of the bt–algebra is done by considering abstractly the algebra generated by the braid generators g_i's together with the idempotents e_i's. Despite the fact that the e_i's are defined by means of the framing generators (see formula (13)), such generators do not appear in the bt–algebra. So, starting from the Hecke algebra, the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra has been constructed by adding framing generators. Now, in the opposite direction, we constructed from the Yokonuma–Hecke the bt–algebra, not containing framing generators. For this reason we say that the bt–algebra is a 'deframization' of the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra.

Thinking in this way one can define naturally deframizations of all the algebras of knots framized listed in [21]. Moreover, there is a natural deframization associated to certain algebras $\mathrm{Y}(d,m,n)$ defined in [7], where d, n are positive integers and m is either a positive integer or ∞. More precisely, for any positive integer a, set $v_1, \ldots, v_a$ as indeterminates. Set $K_m := K(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ for a positive integer m and $K_\infty := K$; we can define a deframization of $\mathrm{Y}(d,m,n)$ as the associative algebra over K_m generated by $T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}$, $E_1, \ldots, E_{n-1}$, $X^{\pm 1}$ subject to the relations (3) to (11) together with the following relations:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} XT_1XT_1 & = & T_1XT_1X & \\ XT_i & = & T_iX & \text{for} \quad i \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\} \\ XE_i & = & E_iX & \text{for} \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \\ (X - v_1) \ldots (X - v_m) & = & 0 & \text{for} \quad m < \infty. \end{array}$$

It is worth to note that the algebras $\mathrm{Y}(d,m,n)$, can be regarded as framizations of knot algebras, and that in fact $\mathrm{Y}(d,1,n)$ is the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra. Notice that by applying the deframization to a framized algebra, we do not recover the original algebra.

Added, October 28, 2015: As we explained in Subsection 5.3, the invariant $\bar{\Delta}$ is a generalization of the invariant Δ for classical links, defined in [20, 19]. These invariants are constructed by using the Jones' recipe applied to the bt–algebra and the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra, respectively; in both algebras a similar expression for the quadratic relation is used. In [6], an invariant Θ for classical links is defined, starting from the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra, but using a different quadratic relation with respect to that used in the definition of Δ. In the same paper [6], it is proved that Θ coincides with the Homflypt polynomial on knots (this was proved later also in [14]), but it may distinguish links that are not distinguished by the Homflypt polynomial. Recently, the first author of the present paper, has verified that $\bar{\Delta}$ distinguishes pairs of links not distinguished by the Homflypt polynomial, and that the pairs distinguished by $\bar{\Delta}$ and Θ do not coincide in some cases. Therefore, we know that the invariant $\bar{\Delta}$ for links is more powerful that the Homflypt polynomial, but its relation with Θ deserves a deeper investigation.

References

[1] F. Aicardi, J. Juyumaya, *Tied Links*, to appear in JKTR. See also arXiv:1503.00527.

[2] F. Aicardi, J. Juyumaya, *An algebra involving braids and ties*, ICTP Preprint IC/2000/179.

[3] E. O. Banjo, *The generic representation theory of the Juyumaya algebra of braids and ties*. Algebr. Represent. Theory **16** (2013), no. 5, 1385–1395.

[4] J.S. Birman, *New points of view in knot theory*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **28** (1993), no. 2, 253–287.

[5] S. Chmutov, S. Jablan, K. Karvounis, S. Lambropoulou, *On the knot invariants from the Yokonuma-Hecke algebras*. To appear in JKTR.

[6] M. Chlouveraki, J.Juyumaya, K. Karvounis, S. Lambropoulou *Identifying the invariants for classical knots andlinks from the Yokonuma-Hecke algebras*. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1505.06666.

[7] M. Chlouveraki , L. Poulain d'Andecy, *Markov traces on affine and cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebras*. International Mathematics Research Notices, **257**, 62 pages. doi:10.1093/imrn/rnv257

[8] M. Chlouveraki, L. Poulain d'Andecy, *Representation theory of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebras*, Adv. Math. **259** (2014) 134–172.

[9] J. Espinoza, S. Ryom-Hansen, *Cell structures for the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra and the algebra of braids and ties*, ArXiv: 1506.00715v2.

[10] B. Gemein, *Singular braids and Markov's theorem*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **6** (1997), no. 4, 441–454.

[11] A.P. Isaev, O. Ogievetsky, *Representations of A-type Hecke algebras*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.3701.

[12] A.P. Isaev, O.V. Ogievetsky, *Baxterized Solutions of Reflection Equation and Integrable Chain Models*, http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0510078.

[13] A. P. Isaev, A. N. Kirillov, *Bethe subalgebras in Hecke algebra and Gaudin models*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.3701.

[14] N. Jacon, L. Poulain d'Andecy *An isomorphism Theorem for Yokonuma–Hecke algebras and applications to link invariants*, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1501.06389.pdf.

[15] V.F.R. Jones, *Hecke algebra representations of braid groups and link polynomials*, Ann. Math. **126** (1987), 335–388.

[16] J. Juyumaya, *Another algebra from the Yokonuma–Hecke algebra*. ICTP Preprint IC/1999/160.

[17] J. Juyumaya, *Markov trace on the Yokonuma-Hecke Algebra*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **13** (2004), 25–39.

[18] J. Juyumaya, S. Lambropoulou, *An invariant for singular knots*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **18**(6) (2009), 825–840.

[19] J. Juyumaya, S. Lambropoulou, *An adelic extension of the Jones polynomial*, in: M. Banagl, D. Vogel (Eds.) The Mathematics of Knots, Theory and Application, in: Contributions in Mathematical and Computational Sciences, **1**, Springer, 2010, 125–142. See also arXiv:0909.2545.
[20] J. Juyumaya, S. Lambropoulou, *p–adic Framed Braids II*, Advances in Mathematics, **234** (2013), 149–191.
[21] J. Juyumaya, S. Lambropoulou, *On the framization of the knot algebras.* To appear in New Ideas in Low–dimensional Topology, L. Kauffman, V. Manturov (eds), Series of Knots and Everything, WS. See: arXiv:1406.6849.
[22] P.P. Martin, A. Elgamal, *Ramified partition algebras.* Mathematische Zeitschrift, **246**(3): 473–500, 2004.
[23] O. Ogievetsky, L. Poulain d'Andecy, *Induced representations and traces for chains of affine and cyclotomic Hecke algebras*, J. Geom. Phys. (2014) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2014.07.005.
[24] S. Ryom–Hansen, *On the Representation Theory of an Algebra of Braids and Ties*, J. Algebr. Comb. **33** (2011), 57–79.

The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Strada Costiera, 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy.
E-mail address: faicardi@ictp.it

Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad de Valparaíso, Gran Bretaña 1111, Valparaíso, Chile.
E-mail address: juyumaya@gmail.com